

PLANNING COMMISSION

ACTION MINUTES

TUESDAY, AUGUST 21, 2001

Chair Parsons called the meeting to order at 8:02 p.m. at the Twin Pines Senior and Community Center.

ROLL CALL:

Present, Commissioners: Parsons, Mathewson, Wiecha, Gibson, Torre, Petersen

Present Staff: Community Development Director Ewing, Principal Planner de Melo, Zoning Technician Stone, Associate Planner Ouse, City Attorney Zafferano, Recording Secretary Flores

AGENDA STUDY SESSION: None

AGENDA AMENDMENTS:

Chair Parsons said that the Study Session on the US Highway 101 Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge and Bikeway would occur later in the evening since the consultants for the project had not arrived yet.

COMMUNITY FORUM (Public Comments):

Chair Parsons presented a plaque in recognition of excellence for Community Service to C Purcell. C Purcell spoke about "Allergy Free Gardening" and mentioned that there are lots of books about City Planning in the local libraries.

City Manager, Jere Kersnar, introduced the new Assistant City Manager, Dan Rich.

Richard Vanderslice received the memo on procedures for dangerous buildings he had asked for at the last meeting. He wanted to know how the MTBE were being cleaned up at the ARCO and neighboring sites. He said that he could no longer live in his house. Also, the City Attorney's office had taken some fruit samples from his yard yet was now unwilling to give him the results. Chair Parsons said he would ask staff to look into the issue, however the raised issues should be addressed to the County. Chair Parsons mentioned that Mr. Vanderslice may want to make an appointment with the City Attorney. CDD Ewing said that the City Attorney does not work for an individual citizen but instead for the City and Council. CDD Ewing said Mr. Vanderslice cannot treat the City Attorney as his personal attorney and recommended that Mr. Vanderslice find his own counsel.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

5A. Minutes for 7-3-01

5B. Minutes for 6-19-01

5C. Minutes for 5-15-01

5D. Minutes for 4-17-01

5E. Minutes for 4-3-01

5F. Resolution denying a Setback Variance, and Single-Family Design Review application to remodel a Single Family Residence at 1642 Prospect Street consistent with action taken by the Planning Commission on August 7, 2001.

MOTION: By C Mathewson, second by C Wiecha, to approve Consent Calendar items 5 A-F.

Ayes: Mathewson, Wiecha, Gibson, Torre, Petersen, Parsons

Chair Parsons announced that these items may be appealed to the City Council within 10 days.

STUDY SESSION:

6B. Consideration of request for extension of Conditional Use Permit granted by Planning Commission on May 16, 2000 for 19 Somerset Court.

PP de Melo summarized the Staff Report recommending an extension to May 16, 2002 of an expired permit unless a Building Permit has been issued by then. CDD said that the actual project approval had already been granted, and the changes were of a minor nature that kept with the design of the home.

MOTION: By C Torre, second by C Petersen, to approve an extension of the Conditional Use Permit to amend the Detailed Development Plan for a Single-Family residence at 19 Somerset Court for one-year.

Ayes: Torre, Petersen, Wiecha, Mathewson, Parsons

Abstain: Gibson

6A. US Highway 101 Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge & Bikeway - Presentation of Conceptual Design.

Duncan Jones gave an update on the project. He described the area that the bike path would currently run through and discussed the changes made to the previous plans. The goal had been to make the bike path pedestrian-friendly. There would be in-street lighted crosswalks and enhanced lighting at the intersection. There would be a Traffic Study of the whole area, which would include Old County Road, Masonic, Hiller, El Camino Real, and Ralston Avenue to find a way to get more of the motorized traffic to leave the area. This would be part of the Traffic Calming Program. He discussed the safety procedures that would be in place. In the school zone, there would be a lowered speed limit to keep children safe. He spoke to the CalTrans alignment project. It would be a dedicated, multi-use trail for bicyclists and pedestrians along Ralston and the southbound off-ramp. Since the last meeting, a website had been created for this project where twenty or so different bridges could be voted on. Also, children had been consulted, and Mr. Jones showed samples of children's drawing suggestions. He discussed the input from the public and mentioned that it was generally agreed upon to have a conventional bridge that could be developed later.

Consultant Mark Ashley said that there had been a lot more input from the public since the last meeting. The consensus at the last workshop was approval of the proposed project. The work groups favored the more conventional bridges. He showed more examples of the children's artwork. There were three themes, aquatic, vegetation, and sports.

Architect Ricardo Rabinas spoke about merging the children's ideas and themes into a more conventional bridge. He further described the design of the bridge. The lighting would be camouflaged to make it hidden. The fencing would be done in a manner that would give the bridge an open feeling. He said that this project continued to be a work in process.

Duncan Jones asked for continued comments from the Commission. He mentioned that this project would go before the Parks and Recreation Commission because they had concerns about the bridge. He hoped that the completed presentation would go before the City Council on September 11, 2001.

C Wiecha asked what type of fabric was being considered for the fence. Mr. Rabinas answered that he expected to use stainless steel mesh, which is a delicate material. It would be possible to get this mesh in different shapes or get a different mesh that came in multiple colors. C Wiecha asked if the components had been priced. Mr. Rabinas said that nothing had been priced yet. C Wiecha said that cost would end up being an important element of the bridge. Duncan Jones said that whether color was desired or not would be a

critical aspect. He mentioned the difference between painting colors on the mesh or allowing the stainless steel to reflect the colors of the surrounding environment. C Wiecha cautioned the use of the colored mesh because it could end up looking like a fabric material and may not be as attractive when used in bulk quantity.

C Wiecha asked for a clarification on the haunched garter. Mr. Ashley said that the intent was to have the haunch as a graphic rendering issue. He said that this newer proposal was on a different alignment, further to the south. C Wiecha mentioned the curvature of the horizontal alignment. Mr. Ashley confirmed that it was a curved horizontal alignment. C Wiecha said that there were a lot of curves and business in the structure. She recommended looking at a standard height fence that was not a chain link fence but instead a railing. Mr. Ashley said that a criterion for the screening was to keep people from throwing objects onto the freeway from the bridge. This explained why the link was relatively small.

Duncan Jones commented that the goal was to have all of the curves work together. The curve patterns worked together to give the wave effect, which was what the children suggested. He agreed with C Wiecha that they would have to make sure that the bridge did not get too wavy.

C Wiecha asked what landscaping issues would arise due to the widening of Masonic. Mr. Jones said that no additional right-of-way was being taken from the existing structures. He said that some landscaping would be impacted but not very much.

C Petersen was concerned about using a chain link fence because she thought it would not look good. She applauded the consultants for the additional input they sought out and their extra effort.

C Torre applauded the consultants for all of their work on the project. She liked the idea of using the curves to make a flowing structure. She was concerned about the height issue and felt that the use of the bridge should be considered, not just the visual aspect. She did not feel that the current simulation made the waved fence pronounced enough that people would know that it was a design feature and not a mistake. Mr. Rabinas said that this issue would be discussed in the next phase of the project. He said that a better angle for the curves might be needed. Mr. Jones said that the new alignment had more curves. He mentioned that he recently read a study, which stated that curved fences did not feel nearly as enclosed as straight fences because you can see through the curved fences to the other part of the bridge and see what was approaching. C Torre said that closure helps those who are afraid of heights. Mr. Jones said that he would look into more studies on this issue.

C Mathewson agreed with the previous Commissioners' comments and said that he appreciated all the work that has been put into this project.

C Gibson asked what the plan was for Ralston west of El Camino and up to Sixth Avenue. He asked if there would be any bike lanes. Mr. Jones said that there would need to be signage for the adult bicyclists to find their way to the Bike Bridge. There would have to be a route. The children cyclists would be routed through the park for their increased safety. Between Sixth and El Camino, the adult cyclists would have to ride with traffic unless some changes were made.

Chair Parsons commented that the design was very interesting. He agreed with the comment about making the curves more pronounced. He liked that the currently proposed fence would help prevent objects from being thrown onto the freeway from the bridge. His concern was that it would be easy to climb. He suggested extending the bridge to the outside of the railing and having some landscaping, like a vine, hang over the bridge to alleviate the concern about looking down on the freeway. This could be an expensive item but also could be done very simply. The sports theme could lead to Belmont being able to sell the name of the bridge to a Bike Company, who would then in turn help fund the project.

C Petersen echoed Chair Parsons' comment about adding some landscape on or hanging down from the bridge. She felt that this would be representative of Belmont. Mr. Jones said that he had not asked the landscape architect to be present at this meeting, but she had attended the public meeting. The intention was to have landscape treatment at both ends of the bridge. It could be a problem to have landscape out on the bridge because the landscape could "trash up" the bridge and create a severe maintenance problem. Chair Parsons said that he would like it considered, but it could be a cost factor. C Torre felt that

aesthetically the vines seemed less desirable than making the curvature and the shadowing of the bridge create the interest.

Chair Parsons thanked the Mr. Jones and consultants for the update and proceeded forward with the meeting.

6C. Review of final landscape/irrigation plan for a five-unit residential project at 1240 Elmer Street consistent with action taken by Planning Commission on May 1, 2001.

PP de Melo summarized the Staff Report, said that the condition for a final landscape plan had been met, and recommended approval.

MOTION: By C Mathewson, second by C Wiecha, to approve the landscape/ irrigation plan as proposed for 1240 Elmer Street.

Ayes: Mathewson, Wiecha, Gibson, Torre, Petersen, Parsons

6D. Hillside Development Policy.

CDD Ewing proposed discussing this issue after the Public Hearing. Chair Parsons said that since this was more of a Study Session item, the Commission would proceed with the Public Hearing items first.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

7A. Public Hearing - 2710 All View Way: To Consider a Setback Variance, Floor Area Exception (FAR) and Single Family Design Review application to remodel the existing 1,562 square foot residence. The proposed remodel will reconfigure and enlarge the space of an existing storage room to provide a two-car garage with a 15'3" driveway where the required backup distance is 18'. The remodel will also reconfigure the interior space and add a new bedroom and bathroom to the first floor, and remodel and enlarge the basement area to construct a home entertainment room and bathroom. The permitted FAR for the dwelling is .493 allowing a maximum of 2,465 square feet. The proposed remodel will total 2,744 square feet, with a corresponding FAR of .555. (Appl. No. 01-0070); APN: 043-243-040; Zoned: R-1B; CEQA Status: Exempt; Peter and Eva Lau - Owner/Applicant

PP de Melo summarized the Staff Report. Staff recommended supporting the application for the Setback Variance but could not make the findings for the Floor Area Exception. He recommended continuing this item to allow the project to come in at the maximum floor area limit for the site's zoning, which it was currently exceeding.

Chair Parsons noticed that this lot had an undeveloped lot behind it. He asked if it would be feasible to merge the lots. PP de Melo said that staff would have to evaluate the option. There may be alternate zoning for this particular lot. If it were possible, then additional square footage would probably become possible.

C Mathewson noticed on the drawing that the fence in front of the house was within public right-of-way and that there was a palm tree on the border of the City's and the applicant's property. He asked if the fence would have to be moved further back if the driveway were created as proposed. PP de Melo said that the fence encroached into the public right-of-way by about two or three feet. As part of the total improvements for the site, the fence would have to be modified to stay within the property line.

C Gibson noticed that the fence was about six feet high and asked if that height was allowed. CDD Ewing said that there was no height regulation on City right-of-way. However, in a front yard, six feet was the maximum height.

Chair Parsons asked the Commission if there was a consensus that the Setback Variance was acceptable. The Commissioners said that there was. Since staff was recommending continuance, he felt that unless the applicant wanted to push the issue that night, it should be continued.

Applicant/Owner Peter Lau said that he was considering removing the fence in the front as part of the remodeling on a safety consideration. As far as the Floor Area Exception, he wanted to work the numbers but first asked for some guidelines from the Commission. Chair Parsons said that the Commission would not necessarily approve a Floor Area Exception to make this house another one of the high-end houses in the neighborhood. Mr. Lau said he would like to have the same privilege as his neighbor, who previously had been given a Floor Area Exception.

Open Public Hearing

Wendell Nickols, 2709 All View Way, mentioned that this project would probably meet the floor space requirement if the extra downstairs room was not added. He did not see any problem with the extra floor area.

MOTION: By C Mathewson, second by C Wiecha, to close the Public Hearing.

Motion passed.

Chair Parsons said that discussion should focus on the proposed square footage. He said that Floor Area Exceptions were allowed to balance inconsistencies or differences in floor area ratios. To grant someone above and beyond what was existing would set a precedent.

C Torre said that the rule the Commission had to follow was in the calculation of the maximum FAR based on the slope. When leeway was granted, it was usually done to allow the applicant to meet the neighborhood average. Just because one house in the neighborhood was previously granted a Floor Area Exception did not mean that this one house represented the neighborhood. In the instances where a Floor Area Exception had previously been made, there had commonly been an unusually large property that resulted in a low floor area ratio. This proposed Floor Area Exception would set a precedent for the neighborhood because this house would bring up the average.

C Mathewson agreed with C Torre and could not make the "Purpose" finding.

C Gibson had the same conclusions as the previous Commissioners. He encouraged the applicant to look into acquiring an open lot.

CDD Ewing said that this lot was zoned R-1B, where Floor Area Transfers were not available. C Gibson asked if there would be a larger floor area ratio if an open lot were to merge with the existing lot. CDD Ewing answered that it would require a zone change because then there would be two zones applied to one large lot.

C Wiecha said that this remodel would substantially increase the size of the existing house in the front and back.

C Petersen clarified that the applicant could still ask for this item to be continued.

Chair Parsons had no objections to a Setback Variance for the garage but said he would not be in favor of a front-yard setback. PP de Melo said that the applicant only applied for a Driveway Setback.

C Torre supported a Setback Variance for the garage but did not support a Floor Area Exception.

Chair Parsons said that there was no consensus on the maximum square footage.

MOTION: By C Wiecha, second by C Mathewson, to continue 2710 All View Way to consider a Setback Variance for a Floor Area Exception and Single-Family Design Review to a date uncertain.

PP de Melo said that there would be a re-noticing when new plans were received. CDD Ewing said that his concern with the motion was that it did not deal with the issue of the request for Floor Area Exception. He

suggested adding a denial of a Floor Area Exception to the motion even though the other items were being continued.

Ayes: Wiecha, Mathewson, Gibson, Torre, Petersen, Parsons

Chair Parsons announced a break at 9:35 PM and resumed the meeting at 9:42 PM.

7B. Public Hearing - 3316 Plateau Drive: To consider a Single Family Design Review to add a two-story addition to the rear of an existing 2,341 square foot two-story house. The project includes construction of a family room on the first floor and a master bedroom and master bath on the second floor. The addition will add 1,133 square feet to the existing residence for a total of 3,474 square feet in a zone that permits 3,500 square feet. (Appl. No. 01-0078); APN: 040-302-130; Zoned: R1-B; CEQA Status: Exempt; Nicolas Severais & Michael and Rochelle Delfino-Applicant/Owner(s)

Zoning Technician Stone summarized the Staff Report, recommended approval, and informed the Commission that the applicant was present.

Open Public Hearing

MOTION: By C Wiecha, second by C Gibson, to close the Public Hearing.

Motion Passed.

C Wiecha asked for clarification about the concrete driveway paving on the left side of the driveway. She said that the plans showed that the applicant wanted to keep some of the concrete driveway paving in place. Owner Michael Delfino said that the addition was on the right side of the house. There was no driveway on that side of the house. C Wiecha asked what was going to happen to the pavement on the left of the driveway. Mr. Delfino said that it would remain in place. Chair Parsons said that it looked like gravel, not concrete, in the photographs.

MOTION: By C Torre, second by C Mathewson, to approve a Single-Family Design Review at 2216 Plateau Drive, with the condition that all pavement be removed that was not directly in front of the garage door to the left side of the driveway.

Ayes: Torre, Mathewson, Wiecha, Gibson, Petersen, Parsons

Chair Parsons announced that the item may be appealed to the City Council within 10 days.

7C. Public Hearing -2662 Belmont Canyon Road: To consider a Single Family Design Review and Floor Area Exception to expand an existing single-family residence to include a 1,070 square feet on a new top story and addition of a covered deck. The remodel will add 1,070 square feet to an existing 2,710 square foot residence for a total of 3,780 square feet in a zoning district that permits 3,500 square feet. (Appl. No. 01-0053); APN: 043-211-070; Zoned: S-1/R-1B; CEQA Status: Exempt; Mary Dunlap - Applicant; Robert Ryan - Owner

AP Ouse summarized the Staff Report and recommended approval.

C Torre quoted finding #3, "the project was compatible with neighboring properties and the design of the building would not result in additional bulk." She thought that this finding had been discussed before and that the language of the Ordinance was significant. She said that when using a computer model, she would like to have the correct language in the finding. She said that she could still make the finding but would like the wording corrected to match the zoning code. CDD Ewing said that staff would look into this issue.

Applicant Mary Dunlap was the designer for the project. When she started the project, she felt that the house appeared to be hidden. It was a gloomy house and in order to brighten it up and make it attractive to live in, she believed that a master bedroom was needed. To do this would include adding another story to

add light both from the street and inside. Also, foundation work would need to be done. There was a lot of parking on this site.

AP Ouse stated that finding #3 was not worded correctly. Instead it should read, "The addition is compatible with the existing residence and neighboring properties." The reference to additional bulk was found in the "Purpose" section that referred to an exception to single-family floor area standards. The purpose read, "Exceptions to single-family floor area standards may be granted to prevent or lessen inconsistencies in floor area ratio standards among neighboring properties and to assist in providing adequate off-street parking when no significant increase in building bulk results, provided such exceptions would not be granted a special privilege which would be inconsistent with the intent of the General Plan or the Zoning Ordinance."

C Torre said that this issue had come up before and at the time, she was told that there was a computer section that staff worked from. Clearly, part of that computer section needed to be dropped. In terms of the reasoning when projects were brought before the Commission in the future for floor area exceptions, she read from the purpose section, "provision to provide for parking or where there is no significant additional bulk." If it were even possible to grant floor area exception where there was significant additional bulk, the first portion would be met. She asked that the computer models be cleaned up.

Open Public Hearing

MOTION: By C Wiecha, second by C Mathewson, to close the Public Hearing.

Motion passed.

C Petersen had driven by the site looking for the house. She said that the house was hidden from the road.

MOTION: By C Mathewson, second by C Petersen, to approve a Single-Family Design Review and Floor Area Exception at 2662 Belmont Canyon Road, with the wording in condition #3 to read that "the addition is compatible with the existing residence and neighboring properties."

Ayes: Mathewson, Petersen, Wiecha, Gibson, Torre, Parsons

Chair Parsons announced that the item may be appealed to the City Council within 10 days.

NEW BUSINESS: None

STUDY SESSION:

6D. Hillside Development Policy.

CDD Ewing summarized the Staff Report. Staff had no specific recommendation for the Commission.

Adam Naser stated that he had given the Commission a letter representing his opinions on the issue. He mentioned the fire hazard issue. Undeveloped lots needed to be maintained to preserve their natural beauty. Chair Parsons suggested using companies that use goats to clean up the lots. A permit would be needed to use goats.

C Wiecha asked for a clarification on CDD Ewing's comments on undertaking a project to develop comprehensive hillside development standards. CDD Ewing said that it was on abeyance, partly because of the permit reengineering process and partly because the Council and the Commission seem to be more focused on identifying particular changes.

C Mathewson wanted clarification about the Council taking on topic #1. He asked staff if they knew what Council was considering when reviewing this issue. CDD Ewing said that the Council had already initiated a Zoning Amendment. The Public Hearing in October would address the amendment, and then it would proceed on to Council.

Chair Parsons asked for confirmation that there had been a consensus at the Joint Meeting. CDD Ewing said that there had been a consensus.

C Petersen had a question on page 2 of the document prepared by staff. She asked if there was some conflict in the way it was laid out. CDD Ewing said that the area plans were adopted as amendments to the General Plan. They were in effect part of the General Plan. C Petersen referred to page 3 and page 4A. CDD Ewing said that there was no percentage above which development was not permitted; however a project with above 30% slope caused greater scrutiny.

C Torre said that conservation easements had been used a lot in the Bay Area to protect open space. CDD Ewing said that Belmont used easements and actually preferred them because then Belmont would still get the open space rights but didn't have the responsibility of maintenance.

C Petersen referred to page 6. CDD Ewing said that the word idiom was used to refer to the current as opposed to the past value. Now, there were more sensitive and careful policies. C Petersen referred to page 7, specifically the steps Council had already taken to make an amendment. She said that it appeared that both the Council and the Commission were interested in making this change. She referred to the Council's position on page 8. CDD Ewing said that this was not an issue that had gone before the Council as of yet.

Chair Parsons suggested that the Commission ask staff to put together an Ordinance that allows someone to get a lot outside of their neighborhood and secondly asked that the Commission receive more information on the actual impact on the slope density formula.

C Torre referred to issue #3, the hillside slope density formula. She asked for clarification on the previously shown chart about the requirement for square footage on a thirty- percent slope. CDD Ewing said that this was the slope density table for the HRO zone, which may be applied Citywide in the future. The base minimum lot size was 10,000 square feet with 1-10% slope. That would mean that 20,000 square feet would be needed for subdivision. The base minimum lot size was 21,400 at 20% slope. C Torre said that having a standard would assist the Commission in making decisions. She was not sure that she could support the previously stated numbers.

C Mathewson said he would definitely support item 3, which he believed was generated from the San Juan Plan. He did not want to see the San Juan Plan eroded.

C Gibson agreed with C Mathewson. He said that the 1,200 square feet was considered a bonus to reward people who transferred to distant lots. This was the reasoning; it was not an oversight. Item 10 was deliberate as well.

CDD Ewing answered the question about whether the slope factor for subdivision came out of the San Juan Hills Area Plan. The San Juan Hills Area Plan was adopted in March 1988 as part of the General Plan. The chart was not in the plan but in March 1989, but one of the implementing ordinances that followed that plan was the HRO standards that included this chart. The chart was in the Zoning Ordinance.

C Torre said that issue 2 would be a change to the San Juan Area plan. She said that maybe staff could present the Commission with specific cases and explain how applying the chart would have affected the cases. CDD Ewing said that the Commission could always change the Zoning Ordinance. PD was a much more flexible tool than Subdivision and R-1. Also, state law only allows four amendments to the General Plan each year. This year, there have already been three amendments and one more was currently pending. Another amendment would have to be piggybacked to a previous amendment. or it would have to wait a few months.

Chair Parsons said that item #2 should be raised at the same time as item #1, and Council had already initiated item #1. He said it was beneficial for a property owner to get hold of another lot. He would like to hear a Public Hearing on the issue. He asked for a consensus, and received four votes. He confirmed that it would be a General Plan amendment. This research would be done by staff to present to the Commission.

REPORTS, STUDIES, UPDATES, AND COMMENTS:

C Gibson said that he had received a memo the past Friday at his home and mentioned that most likely all of the Commissioners could have received it via email. CDD Ewing said that he has had some problems transferring documents to email. He would prefer the Commissioners to have a hard copy of the document, which was delivered by a Community Service Officer.

C Torre said that she has had email problems lately and she does not check her home email very frequently. She preferred the hard copy.

C Petersen mentioned moving forward with neighborhood outreach. She's had several people in Belmont tell her that they like the idea of more neighborhood involvement. CDD Ewing said that at Council's last meeting, it approved a Neighborhood Outreach Strategy. At the last staff meeting, implementation was discussed. It required that as a part of submitting an application, the applicant would have to fill out a form stating how he or she will conduct a neighborhood outreach strategy and the form would then be attached to the materials viewed by the Commission. From that form, the Commission could evaluate the strategy. It would give the applicant some flexibility yet commits him or her to some plan of action. C Petersen asked how it would be checked. CDD Ewing said that the applicant couldn't force the neighbors to appear. He felt that this was as far as the City could reasonably go. He said that the 300' radius list could be used for reference but that notifying nearby neighbors may be enough in some cases.

C Torre said that if she were the applicant, she would want some guidelines to follow. She thought that the applicant would want to be told that if they do "X," they're covered and anything less could be risky. CDD Ewing said he would forward to the Commissioner the applicant's policy and guide.

C Mathewson said that at least two of the residential properties discussed at this meeting did not have outside posted notices at the sites. He asked if there was any recourse for that. CDD Ewing said that staff could only check so often to make sure that the notice was posted.

C Torre requested receiving the packets earlier in the week for the next meeting since the meeting would be the day after Labor Day. CDD Ewing said that packets would be delivered on Wednesday instead of Thursday.

Chair Parsons said that the next Conference of California League of Cities would be in Sacramento from September 12-15.

Chair Parsons announced that he would not be present at the next meeting.

PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF TUESDAY, AUGUST 28, 2001.

Liaison: Commissioner Mathewson

Alternate Liaison: Commissioner Gibson

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting adjourned at 10:42PM to a regular meeting on Tuesday September 4, 2001 at Twin Pines Senior and Community Center.

Craig A. Ewing, AICP

Planning Commission Secretary

Audiotapes of Planning Commission Meetings are available for review

in the Community Development Department.

Please call (650) 595-7416 to schedule an appointment.